

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF030060
Final Office Action Date: 11/10/2009

PATENT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 07 2010

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3 - 9 are pending. Independent claim 1 has been amended to place the claim in a better form for examination. No new matter is believed to be added by the amendment.

Rejection of claims 1, 3 - 8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhmann (EP 1102430 A1) in view of Stajano et al, "The Resurrecting Ducking: Security Issues for Ad-hoc Wireless Networks" (hereinafter Stajano).

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed in applicants' previous response filed on February 9, 2010 and the comments below, claim 1 is patentable over Gerhmann and Stajano, either singly or in combination.

In the advisory action, the examiner alleges that Stajano discloses storing information pertaining to a trust relationship between the device and community, citing the reference to recovery of a "password" on page 6, last paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree that Stajano provides such a teaching.

Applicants submit that the manufacturer storing a password cannot be interpreted to correspond to belong to the community of networked devices. If, for example, a remote control is broken and beyond repair, the manufacturer, taking control of the remote control using the master password, does not belong to the community comprising the remote control and various devices, such as hifi device, TV, heating system, etc. of a household. Stajano fails to disclose or suggest that a device, being such a house hold device, i.e., hifi device, TV, heating system, store information about the remote control no longer trusted.

Regarding the examiner's assertion as to the centralized system administrator, applicants submit that the centralized authentication associated with such a system is not compatible with an ad-hoc network (see for example, Stajano, paragraph 3.1 "However, the ad-hoc network environment poses a fundamental new problem: the absence of on-line server). This is the reason Stajano addresses the issue of secure transient association in paragraph 3.2.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF030060
Final Office Action Date: 11/10/2009

PATENT

In view of the above, applicants submit that the suggested combination of Gehrman and Stajano fail to disclose each and every limitation of the pending claims, in particular the feature "... means adapted to store information about devices of the community having had trust relationships with said device in the past but now not trusted by said device..." Thus, the pending claim are patentably distinguishable over any combination of Gehrman and Stajano.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Gerhmann and Stajano in view of Fraser et al (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0131232).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Fraser is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Gerhmann and Stajano explained above in conjunction with claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF030060
Final Office Action Date: 11/10/2009

PATENT

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

It is believed that there are no additional fees due with regard to the filing of this response. However if there is an additional fee due, please charge the fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
NICHOLAS PRIGENT ET AL.

By: 

Paul P. Kiel, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

Date: 4/7/10

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312